REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Of this claims, 1-17 and 23-26 stand rejected. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as will be explained below. The Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 18-22 are allowed.

In light of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse the objections and rejections in the present Office Action and request reconsideration.

Claims 11, 15, and 21 were objected to due to noted informalities concerning claimed dependencies. The amendments to these claims are believed to address and resolve these objections.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, independent claims 1 and 10 due to the inclusion of "a pixel value" in two instances. The amendments to these claims are believed to obviate this rejection. In particular, it is noted that the second instance of the claimed "a pixel value" has been amended to read "an interpolated pixel parameter value." Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in paragraph 17, which discusses that based on various vertex parameters, a particular pixel parameter is calculated. Further support for this amendment may also be found in paragraph 32, which discusses that the disclosed method of FIG. 2, as an example, improves other prior interpolating pixel parameter techniques. Moreover, paragraph 31 of the present specification clearly indicates that the method repeats for each pixel value until all pixel parameters are calculated. Accordingly, no new matter is believed to be added by this amendment.

Claims 3, 5, 12 and 13 have also been amended in a similar fashion to comport with the amendments to independent claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are believed to be resolved and withdrawal of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly lacking patentable utility and/or useful process. The Office Action states that "the claimed invention fails to carry out any interpolation process" and that "the claimed invention only carries out the generation of numbers (i.e., pixel values, geometric values, or differential values)." The rejection concludes that "the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility." The Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

First, the Applicants submit that, contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, the claimed features of claims 1 and 23 indeed effect and interpolation process. Although the Office Action asserts that the claimed invention only carries out the generation of numbers, interpolation is by definition a calculation process. For example, Webster's dictionary, tenth edition, defines interpolate to mean "to estimate values of a function between two non-values." The claimed methods in claims 1 and 23 actually claim the determination of a value for each of a plurality of pixels based on a vertex parameter value, a first geometric value and a second geometric value, this value being an interpolated pixel parameter value. Determination of this value was also, for example, discussed in paragraphs 28-31 of the present application. Accordingly, the assertion that disclosed invention is inoperative and lacks utility as a result is believed to be incorrect and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants further note that § 2107.01, paragraph II provides directive on examination of inventions that are allegedly "inoperative." This section indicates that such situations where an invention is found to be inoperative and lacking utility are rare. Thus, the Patent Office is cautioned in this section to judicially apply this particular type of § 101 rejection to only those cases where the claimed device must be totally incapable of achieving these for result. This is simply not the case in the present application. Quite the opposite, the disclosed and claimed methods indeed achieve the useful result of interpolating pixel parameters, which improve interpolating pixel parameter techniques by utilizing terms calculated during a set up mode during a calculation mode affording fewer computations and improved precision with a corresponding improvement of processing speed and reduced overhead processing requirements over known prior interpolation pixel parameter techniques. Accordingly, the Applicants further submit that the rejection under § 101 is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action indicates that claims 2-17 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. However, with respect to claims 2-9, it is unclear how these claims can be considered allowable when independent claim 1 from which these claims depend was rejected lacking patentable utility. Nonetheless, with respect to claims 10-17, these claims are believed to now be allowable due to the resolution of the 112 rejections.

Claims 18-22 were indicated as allowed. As the objection to claim 21 has been resolved, the Applicants agree that all of these claims should be allowed.

In light of the foregoing comments, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejections and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____ By: _____

Patrick B. Law
Reg. No. 41,549

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
Telephone: (312) 609-7500
Facsimile: (312) 609-5005

CHICAGO/#1340006.1